

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 10/027,657 | 12/19/2001 | Raimund Meyer | HSS-0001 | 1149 |
| 23550 | 7590 05/17/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC | | | LU, JIA | |
| 75 STATE S | | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | |
| ALBANY, | NY 12207 | | 2611 | <u> </u> |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 05/17/200 | 6 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | H: | | | |
|---|---|---|--------|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | n | | | |
| | 10/027,657 | MEYER ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Jia W. Lu | 2611 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply | pears on the cover sh | eet with the correspondence ad | dress | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMI 136(a). In no event, however, will apply and will expire SIX e, cause the application to bed | MUNICATION. may a reply be timely filed (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this colone ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 F | ebruary 2006. | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This | 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under | Ex parte Quayle, 193 | 5 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-25 is/are pending in the appl | lication. | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,10-12 and 19</u> is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4-9,13-18 and 20-25</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | or election requireme | nt. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 August 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E | xaminer. Note the att | ached Office Action or form PT | O-152. | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr | n priority under 35 U. | S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | |
| a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | | 3 (4) (4) (7). | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority document | ts have been receive | d. | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority document | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the price | | | Stage | | | |
| application from the International Burea | iu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) | J. | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | t of the certified copie | s not received. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | | rview Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) |) 5) 🔲 Not | ice of Informal Patent Application (PTC |)-152) | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 6) ∐ Oth | ۳۱ | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment has been fully considered. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of reference cited in action below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 4, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The DFE filter described in paragraph 41 is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188

USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). According to specifications, the "filter coefficients" that are optimized by "signals after the projections" deal with the DFE structures (see paragraph 23, 41-43), but this feature is not in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2611

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 5-7, 14-16, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,430, 216, in view of US 6,745,050, further in view of US 6,606,129. Patent '216 describes an interference suppression for a multi-antenna system where the projection of a filtered signal is used for detection (see abstract and figure 2, item 102; See figure 4 for the use of projections). The projected signal in figure 4 is also shown to be in the direction of the received vector "y". Patent '216 states:

"The projection builder 98 selects 118 a portion of the filtered sional to process, collec'ts 122 appropriate candidate user codes for the users transmitting signal segments of the selected sitered signal portion from the output of the user code generator, and, using the receive time offsets, trial times, and dandidate symbols, creates 126 a set of hypothetical projection operators." (Column 6, lines 60-67)

Furthermore, after signal projection the signal is processed through a Rake filte (see fig 1, item 82) and detected (see figure 1, items 86 and 90). Regarding claim 11, figure 4 shows that the projection vector is in a 2-d Space. While patent '216 does not show the projection to be orthogonal, patent '050 shows this feature (see column 7, lines 38-51). It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to use orthogonal projection in a system described in patent '216 in order to achieve a robust, generic and accommodating interference suppression. While the combined references used above do not describe adaptive algorithms

Application/Control Number: 10/027,657

Art Unit: 2611

used for adjusting filter coefficients including the use of training sequence or a blind adaptive algorithm, such use is well known in the art (for example see patent '129, column 9, lines 13-30), and it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to use different adaptive algorithms for filter coefficient adjustments in order to provide flexible processing techniques to accommodate changing environments.

Page 4

- 3. Claims 8, 17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,430, 216, in view of US 6,745,050, further in view of US 6,018,317. These claims share limitations with claims rejected in 2 above; further, patent '317 shows the calculation of orthogonal complements of projections (column 21, lines 30-33), and it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to calculate orthogonal complements in the receiver in '216 in order to identify and separate signals from interference and aid in signal recovery (column 21, lines 28-45).
- 4. Claims 9, 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,430, 216, in view of US 6,745,050. These claims share limitations with claims rejected in 2 above; further, '216 treats at least a part of transmit signals as interference (see abstract).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1, 3, 10, 11, 12, 19 are allowed. Prior art failed to show a method interference suppression comprising forming orthogonal projection of at least one

Art Unit: 2611

filter output signal onto a vector before equalization and signal detection, where at least two received signals are available corresponding to at least two outputs projected onto identical vectors; Prior art also failed to show a method interference suppression comprising forming orthogonal projection of at least one filter output signal onto a vector before equalization and signal detection, where equalization included feedforward filters of a DFE, according to the criteria ZF, MMSE or impulse truncation.

Page 5

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jia W. Lu whose telephone number is 571-272-6042. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri, 10:30AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chieh M. Fan can be reached on (571)272-3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 6

Jia Lu Examiner

CHIEH M. FAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER